1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Coconino County Detention Facility PO Box 247 Phoenix, MD 21131 Pro Se IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COLUMN	O 3 2025 DISTRICT COURT FOF ARIZONA DEPUTY
10 11 12 13 14 15 16	United States of America, Plaintiff Vs. Samuel R Bateman, Defendant This document is not to repeat a notion to produce the production of the production o	FORCE RDER LIX, INC A, LLC IN PROPER FORM ACCORDING DCAL RULES AND PRACTICES
17 18 19 20	REFERENCE LRCW 5.4 (Rule Number/Section) Defendant, Samuel Rappylee Bateman, appearing pro se, respectfully	
21	moves this Court to enforce the Protective Order entered on July 6, 2023	
22	11	
23 24	Procedure, and to issue relief directed specifically to Netflix, Inc. and Ark Media, LLC.	
25		
26	I. Background	
27	1. On July 6, 2023, the Court entered a Protective Order (Dkt. 186) governing	
28	discovery materials in this case. That order was issued to permit full	
	MOTION TO ENFORCE PROTECTIVE ORDER - 1 - Case N	O. <u>22-CR-08092-SMB</u>

disclosure of the government's investigation while protecting the **private** and personally identifying information (PII) of victims and witnesses, including minors, and sensitive information about cooperators.

- 2. The Protective Order restricts dissemination of discovery materials beyond the defense team and prohibits their use for any purpose other than preparing the defense.
- 3. Upon information and belief, **Netflix**, **Inc.** and **Ark Media**, **LLC** have obtained private journals, photographs, and video recordings that were produced in discovery and are subject to the Protective Order.
- 4. Netflix and Ark Media are preparing to publish a documentary based on these materials. Their possession and intended use of such evidence is inconsistent with the Protective Order and threatens to expose sensitive PII of victims and witnesses, including minors.

II. Legal Standard

Federal courts have broad authority to enforce protective orders issued under Rule 16(d)(1). Seattle Times Co. v. Rhinehart, 467 U.S. 20, 34–36 (1984). These orders are designed to protect the privacy and safety of victims, witnesses, and cooperating individuals, and courts retain inherent power to ensure compliance. Third parties who unlawfully obtain discovery materials covered by a protective order may be subject to court enforcement proceedings. See *United States v. Smith*, 985 F. Supp. 2d 506, 543 (S.D.N.Y. 2013).

III. Argument

A. Netflix and Ark Media's planned publication would violate the Protective Order.

The Protective Order was entered specifically to prevent dissemination of unredacted PII of victims and witnesses, including minors, and to safeguard

sensitive information about cooperators. If Netflix and Ark Media publish the protected materials, they will be circumventing the Court's order and undermining its purpose.

B. Enforcement is necessary to protect victims and witnesses.

This case involves not only Defendant's rights but also the rights and safety of victims and minors. Public dissemination of PII would cause irreparable harm by exposing these individuals to harassment, stigmatization, or worse. Such harm cannot be undone once private information enters the public sphere.

C. The Court has authority to act against Netflix and Ark Media.

Although they are non-parties, Netflix and Ark Media are subject to this Court's authority where they possess materials governed by the Protective Order. The Court has inherent power to bind those in possession of restricted discovery materials and to prevent violations of its orders. See *Regal Knitwear Co. v. NLRB*, 324 U.S. 9, 14 (1945).

IV. Relief Requested

Defendant respectfully requests that the Court:

- 1. Issue an Order to Show Cause directing Netflix, Inc. and Ark Media, LLC to explain how they obtained discovery materials covered by the Protective Order (Dkt. 186);
- 2. Enjoin Netflix, Inc. and Ark Media, LLC from publishing, distributing, or otherwise using any discovery materials subject to the Protective Order;
- 3. Order Netflix, Inc. and Ark Media, LLC to identify all protected materials in their possession and return or destroy them in accordance with the Court's directive; and
- 4. Grant such other relief as the Court deems just and proper to enforce compliance with the Protective Order and protect the privacy of victims and witnesses.

V. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Defendant respectfully requests that the Court grant this Motion and take immediate steps to enforce the Protective Order against Netflix, Inc. and Ark Media, LLC.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Sept. 4, 2025

Samuel Bateman, Defendant Pro Se

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that on this 24 day of September, 2025, I caused a true		
and correct copy of the foregoing Motion to Enforce Protective Order to be sent		
to the Clerk of the Court and served by first-class U.S. mail, postage prepaid,		
upon:		

Dimitra Hotis Sampson

Office of the United States Attorney

District of Arizona

2 Renaissance Square

40 N Central Ave., Ste 1800

Phoenix, AZ 85004-4408

Dated this 24, day of September 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Samuel Bateman, Pro Se